



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/798,430

03/12/2004

Manabu Nakamura

250364US2

6547

22850

7590

11/01/2007

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

TSUI, WILSON W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2178

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/01/2007

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/798,430

Applicant(s)

NAKAMURA, MANABU

Examiner

Wilson Tsui

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-16, 19, 21-23 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-16, 19, 21-23, and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on: 08/07/2007.
2. Claims 1, 15, 16, 19, 22, and 23 are amended. Claims 10, 17, 18, 20, 24, and 25 are cancelled, Claim 26 is new. Claims 1, 22, and 23 are amended. Claims 1-9, 11-16, 19, 21-23, and 26 are pending.
3. The 35 USC 112 rejections with respect to claims 15 and 16 are withdrawn.
4. Claims 1-5, 22, and 23 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge, Claim 6 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge, in further view of Reshef et al, Claim 7 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge, in further view of Reshef et al and Nielson, Claim 8 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge, in further view of Reshef et al and Nielson and Brown et al, Claim 9 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge, in further view of Rizzo et al, Claims 11-16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge, in further view of Rivera et al and Shafron et al, Claim 19 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge, in further view of Meffert et al, Claim 21 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge, in further view of Matsuda et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5, 22, and 23 remain rejected, and claim 26 is under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000), Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), and Stonehenge ("Web Techniques Column 56", published: Dec 2000, pages 3, 6-8).

With regards to claim 1, Saravanan teaches an information providing apparatus for providing prescribed information to a user terminal comprising:

b) *A frame page creator configured to create a requested frame page requested from the user terminal, the frame page having a plurality of frames:* the server creates a frame page having a plurality of frames to be displayed on the client/user terminal based upon the user's request (Fig 2, paragraph 0040: whereas, the prescribed information is located in a first frame (reference number 204: known as the workspace frame) among other frames, such as the navigation frame (reference number 202)

c) *The frame page creator including a loading page module* (paragraph 0061: whereas a first web page is created and sent to be loaded on the client device (information display device), and the first web page comprises a workspace frame and a navigation

Art Unit: 2178

frame which is used for loading prescribed information, including workspace and navigation content), *configured an argument from a first URL transmitted from the user terminal to create a loading page, and transmit the created loading page to the user terminal*: whereas, each frame page has associated argument from a URL (paragraph 0029: whereas, a web page location is identified using the information in a URL/hyperlink, and also when the URL identification information refers the web page content location, then the frame page is created and loaded in the client's browser cache), *a frame page module configured to create the frame page having a plurality of frames to be displayed in the loading page*: whereas, based on the specific content requested, the loading module includes inherently specifies arguments for the frame page module such that the frame page containing prescribed information is created for display (whereas, inherency for the arguments being specified, is based on the teachings that a *specific* frame page is created for display based upon the identification data in a URL request, as explained above, and thus arguments have been specified by the loading page module). In addition the frame page has a plurality of frames are displayed/loaded (and thus also acts as a frame page loader) on the client/user terminal (Fig 2, paragraph 0040: whereas, the prescribed information is located in a first frame (reference number 204: known as the workspace frame) among other frames, such as the navigation frame (reference number 202) to be loaded into the client device for display).

However, Saravanan does not expressly teach the argument, and to create a loading page *that contains the extracted argument, the argument being used to specify*

information to be displayed in one of the frames and a display mode of another of the frames, a second URL supplied from the user terminal based on the loading page, the frame page to be displayed according to the argument in the loading page.

Kolsy teaches the argument (Fig 9: whereas a server name is specified), and a *second URL supplied from the user terminal based on the loading page*, the frame page to be displayed according to the argument specified in the loading page. (Kolsy, paragraph 0025: whereas a frames page/loading page is sent to the client for the purpose of loading specific frame data. Furthermore, as explained in the Abstract (Abstract of Kolsy), the loading page sent to the client also includes a target web page sent in response to a request, such that the target web page will establish the frame page for which the target web content is in a first frame, and an advertisement is in a second frame of a frame page. Thus, the target web page acts as the loading page to call/request a frame page for generation from a frame page module such that a first frame is specified (the argument) directly or indirectly to include the target web content based upon an argument in the request (Kolsy, Abstract). A second URL supplied from the user terminal, based on a selection in the loading page (paragraph 0071: whereas the user clicks on a hyperlink (specifying frame content) in the content frame, the frame page displayed according the advertisement display-mode specified in the loading page. The URL supplied from the user terminal can be a second URL, supplied from the user terminal, since the user can return back to the loading page (reference 517) and select another URL as shown in Fig. 5).

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan et al's loading module, to further include the ability to create a loading page, as taught by Kolsy. The combination of Saravanan, and Kolsy would have allowed Saravanan to have implemented an apparatus for loading web pages and to also have modified associated data ... without having to recode the web page (Kolsy, paragraph 0006).

However the combination of Saravanan and Kolsy do not expressly teach to create a loading page *that contains the extracted argument, the argument being used to specify the requested frame page, and a display mode of the frame page.*

Stonehenge teaches , to create a loading page *that contains the extracted argument, the argument being used to specify the information to be displayed in one of the frames, and a display mode another of the frames* (page 7, lines 53-74: whereas a loading page contains an extracted chat argument, the argument in the '\$code' variable. The code variable containing a read or write argument (page 7, lines 53 and 66) used to specify the frame of a chat window, such that the chat data is displayed in a chat frame (display mode)).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to have modified Saravanan et al, and Kolsy's system for creating a loading page, such that the loading page contains an argument as taught by Stonehenge. The combination of Saravanan et al, Kolsy, and Stonehenge would have allowed Saravanan et al to have created a web chat using "any browser that supports frames and client-side pull" (Kolsy, page 3, P4, and P7).

With regards to claim 2, Saravanan teaches the information providing apparatus of claim 1, *wherein the frame page creator is configured to create the frame page such that said prescribed information is to be displayed in a first frame* (such as Fig. 11, reference number 1106), *and that second information associated with said prescribed information is to be displayed in a second frame so as to match the prescribed information displayed in the first frame* (Fig. 11, paragraph 0059: whereas, a second frame (reference number 1102), is associated with the content of the workspace frame (reference number 1106), since the second frame is a site map/navigational structure, that is associated with the navigation/location of the workspace frame data displayed in the second frame.

With regards to claim 3, for an information providing apparatus of claim 2, performing a similar method as the method in claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 4, Saravanan teaches *an information providing apparatus of claim 2, wherein the second information is to be displayed in a tree structure in the second frame* (Fig. 11, paragraph 0059: whereas a tree structure is shown in the second frame (reference number 1102)).

With regards to claim 5, Saravanan teaches an information providing apparatus of claim 1, *wherein the frame page creator is configured to create the frame page such that the frame page is to be displayed according to a layout designated by the argument contained in the first URL*: whereas, the server acts as the frame page creator which creates a frame page and adjusts the layout of the frame page, based on the argument

sent by user navigation selection (Fig. 4). Furthermore, the selection is based on the first URL as explained in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 22, for an information providing apparatus performing a similar method as the apparatus in claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 23, for an information displaying device, that performs a method similar to the method performed by the apparatus of claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 26, for an information display device, that performs a method similar to the method performed by the apparatus of claim 1, is rejected under similar rationale.

6. Claim 6 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000), Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), and Stonehenge ("Web Techniques Column 56", published: Dec 2000, pages 3, 6-8), in further view of Reshef et al (US Patent: 6,865,593 B1, published: Mar. 8, 2005, filed: Jun. 12, 2000).

With regards to claim 6, Saravanan, Kolsey, and Stonehenge teaches an information providing apparatus of claim 1, *wherein the frame page creator is configured to create the frame page such that the frame page is to be displayed*, as explained in the rejection for claim 1 above, and is rejected under the same rationale. However,

Art Unit: 2178

Saravanan does not teach the frame page is *displayed with a language designated by the argument contained in the first URL*.

Reshef et al teaches a web page is *displayed with a language designated by the argument contained in a URL* (columns 14 and 15, lines 65-67 and 1-2 respectively: whereas, a web page is displayed in English based upon the argument contained in a URL).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan and Kolsy's frame page creator to be configured such that it would create a frame/web-page based on an interpretation of the language designated by an argument contained in a URL as taught by Reshef et al. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, and Reshef et al would have allowed Saravanan's information providing apparatus to have displayed framed data in a language that was native to the users of the apparatus.

7. Claim 7 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000), Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), and Stonehenge ("Web Techniques Column 56", published: Dec 2000, pages 3, 6-8), in further view of Reshef et al (US Patent: 6,865,593 B1, issued: Mar. 8, 2005, filed: Jun. 12, 2000) and Nielson (US Patent: 5,875,443, issued: Feb 23, 1999, filed: Jan 30, 1996).

With regards to claim 7, Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, and Reshef et al teaches an information providing apparatus of claim 6, which comprises a determination unit for *determining the language that is designated by the argument*, as explained in the rejection for claim 6 above, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Saravanan does not teach the determination unit determines whether the language designated by the argument *is supported by the information providing apparatus*. Nielson teaches a determination unit for *determining the language designated by the argument is supported by a database system* (column 8, lines 12-16: whereas a check is performed to see if a language is supported by a database system using the language argument retrieved from a URL as further explained in column 7, lines 48-65). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, and Reshef et al's determination unit, such that it would be further configured to determine whether the language designated by the argument is supported by a particular system/apparatus, as taught by Nielson. The combination of Saravanan, Reshef et al, Stonehenge would have allowed Saravanan's information providing apparatus to have been able include error checking for language support.

8. Claim 8 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000), Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), and Stonehenge ("Web Techniques Column 56", published: Dec 2000, pages 3, 6-8), in further view of Reshef et al (US Patent:

6,865,593 B1, issued: Mar. 8, 2005, filed: Jun. 12, 2000) and Nielson (US Patent: 5,875,443, issued: Feb. 23, 1999, filed: Jan. 30, 1996) and Brown et al (US Application: 2003/0131316 A1, published: Jul. 10, 2003, filed: Jan. 7 2002).

With regards to claim 8, Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, Reshef et al, and Nielson teach an information providing apparatus of claim 7, which comprises:

- a) *A frame page creator configured to create the frame page such that the frame page is to be displayed with a language*, as explained in the rejection of claim 7 above, and is rejected under the same rationale.
- b) A determination unit to determine if the language designated by the argument is supported by the information providing apparatus, as explained in the rejection of claim 7 above, and is rejected under the same rationale.

However, Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, Reshef et al, and Nielson do not teach displaying a language *used in an operations panel of the image providing apparatus if the language designated by the argument is not supported* by the information providing apparatus.

Brown et al teaches an information providing apparatus that comprises a determination unit used to determine that should a *language indicated by a language indicator* not be supported, then a default language is displayed in the operations panel of the information providing apparatus (paragraph 0024: whereas, using language indicator data retrieved from the client, a default language is displayed if the language designated by the indicator is not supported).

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, Reshef et al, and Nielson's determination unit and frame page creator such that a default language is displayed in the operations panel of the information providing apparatus, as taught by Brown et al. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, Reshef et al, Nielson, and Brown et al would have allowed Saravanan's information providing apparatus to have been able to default to a particular a language to have avoided an unknown operational state when a language requested is not supported.

9. Claim 9 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000), Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), and Stonehenge ("Web Techniques Column 56", published: Dec 2000, pages 3, 6-8), in further view of Rizzo et al (US Patent: 6,470,338 B1, published: Oct. 22, 2002, filed: Jul. 7, 2000).

With regards to claim 9, Saravanan teaches an information providing apparatus of claim 1, *where the frame page creator is configured to create the frame page such that the frame page is to be displayed in a user mode designated by the argument* (paragraph 0050: whereas, the server, acting as the frame page creator, takes user identification/argument data and password to determine the level of access, for restricting access to specific frame based information). Furthermore, Saravanan teaches requesting a frame page using a URL as explained in the rejection for claim 1

above. However, Saravanan does not teach user mode argument *is contained in the first URL*.

Rizzo et al teaches user mode argument and password *contained in a URL* (column 8, lines 1-10: whereas user ID and password is embedded in a URL).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan's first URL request for a frame page to further include user identification information embedded in an URL as taught by Rizzo et al.

The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, and Rizzo et al, would have allowed Saravanan's system to incorporated argument data in a URL such that "it can be passed to the system automatically" (Rizzo et al, column 8, lines 1-10).

10. Claims 11-16 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000), Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), and Stonehenge ("Web Techniques Column 56", published: Dec 2000, pages 3, 6-8), in further view of Rivera et al (US Application: US 2002/0107699 A1, published: Aug. 8, 2002) and Shafron et al (US Application: US 2003/0014479 A1, published: Jul. 10, 2003, filed: Jan. 7, 2002).

With regards to claim 11, Saravanan teaches an information providing apparatus, comprising:

a) A frame page creator, for creating a *frame page* having a plurality of frames, as described in claim 1 above, and is rejected under the same rationale. Additionally, the

loading page has a particular loading page definition format, such as the one shown in Fig. 11)

However, Saravanan does not teach *inserts the extracted argument in the loading page definition format to create the loading page.*

The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge teach *inserts the extracted argument in the loading page definition format to create the loading page, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1.*

With regards to claim 12, Saravanan teaches:

b) *Format information that defines a format of the frame page* (paragraph 0010:

whereas, format instructions are used as format information to define the format of a second web page that contains frames).

c) *argument in the first URL*, as described in claim 1 above and is rejected under the same rationale.

d) Frame instructions for creating a frame can include instructions in a java based language (paragraph 0011).

However Saravanan does not teach an information providing apparatus of claim 11, comprising: *a data converting unit configured to convert the argument of a prescribed format into a format suitable for creation of the frame page, wherein the frame page creator creates the frame page based on the converted argument.*

Yet, Shafron et al teaches *a data converting unit configured to convert the argument of a prescribed format"* (paragraphs 0062-0068: whereas, the URL identifies the location/argument of a web page, and is converted into XML data).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan's apparatus for applying format and argument information, to further include the method for converting the information to XML data. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, and Shafron et al would have allowed Saravanan's apparatus to have used one of the standard methods for data exchange between systems of varying platforms.

However, Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, and Rivera et al do not teach ... *into a format suitable for creation of the frame page, wherein the frame page creator creates the frame page based on the converted argument.*

Rivera et al teaches an information providing apparatus that comprises: ... *into a format suitable for creation of the frame page, wherein the frame page creator creates the frame page based on the converted argument* by implementing format information that defines the format of a frame page, for which the format information is used with XML data to *create a frame page* (paragraph 0040: *whereas, format information is contained in XSL data, and is combined with XML content data to create a frame page*). Furthermore the XSL data is chosen based on user identification data, or user-level data when formatting a frame page (paragraph 0038).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, and Shafron et al's frame page creator, to also include the ability to use the format information in an XSL file with XML data, to create a frame page based on identification data as taught by Rivera et al. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, Shafron et al and Rivera et al would

Art Unit: 2178

have allowed Saravanan's system to have "moved data to and from systems in a seamless, low impact, fashion" (paragraph 0006).

With regards to claim 13, Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, Rivera et al, and Shafron et al teach an information providing apparatus of claim 12, comprising a *data converting unit used by the frame page creator*, as explained in claim 12, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, Rivera et al, and Shafron et al do not teach the data converting unit is *used by web page creators*.

Yet, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art for to use the data converting unit in combination with the technology of a frame page creator (which creates frames for display in a web browser), to also incorporate the same data/technology using a data converting unit in a web page creator (which also creates web pages). The examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE of this. It would have been advantageous to utilize this combination because accommodate a common means of information exchange between the web page creation and frame creation.

With regards to claim 14, Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, Rivera et al, and Shafron et al teach an information providing apparatus of claim 11, *wherein the frame page module has format information that defines a format of the frame page, the format information including an extensible stylesheet language (XSL) file*, as explained in the claim rejection of claim 12 above, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 15, Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, Rivera et al, and Shafron et al teach an information providing apparatus of claim 14, an argument of the second URL is the argument contained in the loading page; and wherein *the frame*

Art Unit: 2178

page creator converts the argument contained in the second URL (the argument contained in the second URL is the advertisement specification data, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1) into XML data, and applies the XML data to the XSL file to create the frame page, as explained in the claim rejection of claim 12 above, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 16, Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, Rivera et al, and Shafron et al teach an information providing apparatus of claim 12, wherein an argument of the second URL is the argument contained in the loading page; and *wherein the frame page module has format information that defines a format of the frame page and includes an extensible style sheet (XSL), converts the argument contained in the second URL (the argument contained in the second URL is the advertisement specification data, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1) into XML data, and the data converting unit executes XSL transformation on the XML data, as explained in the claim rejection of claim 12, above, and is rejected under the same rationale.*

11. Claim 19 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000), Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), and Stonehenge ("Web Techniques Column 56", published: Dec 2000, pages 3, 6-8), in further view of Meffert et al (US Application: US 2003/0037261 A1, published: Feb. 20, 2003, filed: May 1, 2002).

With regards to claim 19, Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge teach *the first URL that includes the argument but not having a direct path name*, as similarly explained in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge do not teach *an email creating unit configured to create an e-mail containing the first URL, the created e-mail being transmitted to the user terminal*.

Meffert et al teaches *an email creating unit configured to create an email containing a URL, the created e-mail being transmitted to a user terminal* (paragraph 0050).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravanan, Kolsy, and Stonehenge's second URL to be included in an email message as taught by Meffert et al. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, and Meffert et al would have allowed Saravanan's information providing apparatus to have notified a user of an event/alarm prior to an information update/exchange via confirmation through an email.

12. Claim 21 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saravanan (US Application: US 2002/0007369 A1, published: Jan. 17, 2002, filed: Dec. 18, 2000), Kolsy (US Application: US 2003/0163372 A1, published: Aug. 28, 2003, filed: Dec 6, 2002, EEFD: Dec. 7, 2001), and Stonehenge ("Web Techniques Column 56", published: Dec 2000, pages 3, 6-8), in further view of Matsuda et al (US Application: US 2001/0029521 A1, published: Oct 11, 2001, filed: Mar. 28, 2001).

With regards to claim 21, Saravanan teaches a server based *information processing apparatus*, as explained in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Saravanan does not teach the server based information processing apparatus is an *image processing apparatus*.

Matsuda et al teaches a server based *image processing apparatus* (paragraph 0020).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Saravnan's server based information processing apparatus to also include the ability execute a server based image processing apparatus as taught by Matsuda et al. The combination of Saravanan, Kolsy, Stonehenge, and Matsuda et al would have allowed Saravanan's information providing apparatus to have "notified the user of the status of such an apparatus by displaying it on a host computer" (paragraph 0004).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed 08/01/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

14. With respect to claim 1, first, the applicant argues that the '372 application "fails to disclose a frame page module configured to receive a *second URL supplied from the user terminal based on the loading page, as recited in claim 1*", since the user 505 clicks on a hyperlink, but does not disclose a frame page module receiving a *second URL supplied from the user terminal* based on a loading page, as required by claim 1, and that the '372 application only discloses receiving a single URL from a user terminal.

However, this argument is not persuasive since the '372 application teaches that the URL supplied from the user terminal can be a second URL, supplied from the user terminal, since the user can return back to the loading page (reference 517) and select another URL as shown in Fig. 5.

Secondly, the applicant argues that "the Office Action fails to identify which variable in the code listing in the Stonehenge reference reads on the claimed argument". However, as explained in the previous office action, a chat argument extracted, and the examiner further points to page 7, line 48 of Stonehenge, which shows the variable is '\$code' (reading on the claimed argument), which stores the path of the request from the webserver, such that '\$code' will store whether the argument is 'write' (checked in page 7, line 66) or 'read' (checked in page 7, line 53).

Third, the applicant argues that the Stonehenge reference fails to disclose a loading page module configured to extract *an argument from a first URL transmitted from the user terminal*. However, this argument is not persuasive, since the argument is contained in a first URL transmitted from the user terminal and is read into the '\$code' variable as shown in page 7, line 48.

Fourth, the applicant argues that the Stonehenge reference fails to disclose a loading page module that is configured to create a loading page that contains the extracted argument, the argument being used to specify information to be displayed in one of the frames and a display mode of another of the frames; but rather Stonehenge teaches the name and message of a chat user to be entered into the chat. However this argument is not persuasive since the extracted argument indicates a write frame, or a

Art Unit: 2178

read frame to be used, thus specify read or write information to be displayed in one of the frames (the read information indicated in page 7, lines 53-64, and the write information indicated in page 7, lines 66-73). Additionally, in page 7, line 54, it shows that the chat argument extracted can further include extracting arguments that are used to specify update/refresh of another read frame (page 7, lines 56-58). Thus, the applicants argument is not persuasive.

The applicant also argues that "if the code identified in Stonehenge is part of a "loading page" module, it is unclear how the claimed argument, which has not been identified in this code, has any relation to the frame page module, which is configured to create a frame page, and display it according to the argument in the loading page. However, as explained in the response to arguments above, the argument can indicate a read or write frame, such that the correct data is displayed in a corresponding frame indicated by the argument. Thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

15. With regards to applicant's argument that claims 22, and 23, which recite limitations analogous to the limitations recited in claim 1, and are thus, allowable; is not persuasive since claim 1 has been shown/explained to be rejected.

16. With regards to the applicant's argument that claims 6-9, 11-16, 19, and 21 are allowable, since they fail to remedy the deficiencies of the '369 application the '372 application, and the Stonehenge reference, is not persuasive, since the combination of the cited references have been explained/shown to teach the required claim language.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2178

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

W. T. 10/24/07

Wilson Tsui
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
October 24, 2007



CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER